

### REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the examiner for the many courtesies extended to him during the telephone conference of December 1st, 2004, and the subsequent examiner's interview conducted on December 8, 2004. Applicant also wishes to thank the examiner for her thorough examination of applicant's specification and claims for informalities of language, and applicants hereby amend the specification to remove the many informalities noted by examiner.

#### *Drawings objection*

Applicant has amended Figure 1 to label it as "prior art", and a replacement sheet is hereby submitted for approval.

#### *Objection to specification.*

Applicant has amended the specification to remove the many informalities noted in the examiner's letter, with the exception of item No. 3. The reference numeral "90" does, in fact, appear in Figure 5 as the right-most numeral label, and no amendment to either the specification or figure is believed required.

Furthermore, with respect to item No. 9, the referenced specification paragraph beginning at page 15, line 15, has been amended to more clearly identify the referenced dimensional information with respect to each of the wall elements, and reference numeral 232 is now believed to be supported.

No new matter is believed to have been added by these amendments, and the amendments are believed to address the examiner's concerns.

#### *Claims objection*

Applicant has amended the claims to remove the many informalities noted in the examiner's letter. No new matter is believed to have been added by these amendments, and the amendments are believed to address the examiner's concerns.

***Claims rejection – 35 U.S.C. §102(b)***

Independent claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Graham (U.S. Patent No. 4,630,371) or Gorski (U.S. Patent No. 4,823,464) or Nash (U.S. Patent No. Des 347,773). However, all of the remaining claims in the application, specifically article claims 2-10 (which are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1) and methods claims and 12-20 (which are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 11) have been deemed allowable over these same prior art references, as well as the remainder of the prior art of record. Accordingly, claims 2-10 and 12-20 stand "objected to as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if amended to overcome (sic) the objection as set forth and rewritten in independent form including all of limitations of the base claim in any intervening claims."

With respect to claim 2, additional claim limitations are provided, claiming a weed trimmer cover assembly with a cover attachment means comprising (1) a *hinge* and (2) a *positional fixing linkage* connected to the front cover, (3) wherein the front cover may be *pivoted* about the hinge *and thereby raised upward* into (4) a *fixed position* with the positional fixing linkage, (5) the fixed position located along a *range of positions from completely lowered downward to completely raised upward*, and (6) wherein the front horizontal cover region and front vertical flange deflect debris being projected by the cutting element when the front cover is in the fixed position, thereby *preventing the projected debris from being distributed upward and rearward* relative to the weed trimmer. With these additional claim limitations, claim 2 stands "objected to" but not rejected over the prior art.

Applicant herewith amends claim 1 to incorporate some of these claim limitations: specifically, the (1) *hinge*, (3) wherein the front cover may be *pivoted* about the hinge *and thereby raised upward* (5) along a *range of positions from completely lowered downward to completely raised upward*, and (6) wherein the front horizontal cover region and front vertical flange deflect debris being projected by the cutting element, thereby *preventing the projected debris from being distributed upward and rearward* relative to the weed trimmer.

It is believed that none of the prior art references of record, individually or in combination, teach all four of these claim limitations, and that claim 1 as amended is allowable over the prior art of record.

(The remaining two limitations have been left in amended dependent claim 2 - (2) a *positional fixing linkage* connected to the front cover, wherein the front cover may be pivoted into a (4) *fixed position* located along the range of positions.)


Furthermore, the present amendments to claims 1 and 2 were sent to the examiner in an informal facsimile communication and also discussed with the examiner in a telephone interview conducted on this same date of December 8, 2004. The examiner indicated in the interview that as proposed amended claims 1 and 2 would be allowable over the prior art of record, and recommended that the amendments be filed formally of record: these amendments are now formally filed herewith.

Amended independent method claim 11 and amended dependent method claim 12 correspond to article claims 1 and 2 respectively and are similarly amended. They are now believed to be allowable for the same reasons. And, as claims 3-10 are directly or indirectly dependent upon amended claim 1, and claims 13-20 are directly or indirectly dependent upon amended claim 11, these claims are also believed to be allowable as amended or originally submitted.


Claims 1-20 as presently amended or originally submitted are thus presently amended commensurate with the examiner's comments, and accordingly the application is believed in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

 8, 2004

By:

  
Patrick J. Daugherty, Reg. No. 41,697  
Driggs, Lucas, Brubaker & Hogg Co., L.P.A.  
CUSTOMER NO. 23266

PJD:cg